

# PRIMITIVE MAN

*QUARTERLY BULLETIN*

OF THE

*CATHOLIC ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONFERENCE*

---

Vol. I, Nos. 3 and 4

Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

July and October, 1928

---

## PRIMITIVE LANGUAGES NUMBER

### CONTENTS

	Page
Primitive Languages	17
Selected Bibliography on Primitive Languages	24
Field Methods	24
About the Conference	28
Child-Training: Bibliography	29

---

## PRIMITIVE LANGUAGES

THE present short article is intended, not as a systematic introduction to the subject of primitive linguistics, but as an attempt to answer some of the questions that are more frequently asked about the languages of primitive peoples. The illustrations will be drawn largely from the language with which the writer is more familiar personally, that of the Têtes de Boule, an Indian tribe of Northern Quebec. These people are at a very low level of material culture, nomad hunters and trappers without any trace of agriculture. They speak one of the dialects of the Cree language, the Cree being in turn one of the languages of the great Algonquian linguistic stock. Algonquian prevailed over the larger part of a roughly triangular area that had its western apex in the Canadian Rockies and its base on the Atlantic coast from Labrador to North Carolina.

1. How far can we go towards tracing back all languages to a common source? We know, for instance, that all the Indo-European languages, spoken from Hindustan to Western Europe, are descended from a common ancestral tongue, even though this ancestral tongue has itself disappeared. Can similar descent be traced to a common ancestor for all the languages of the world, or at least can we hope that it will in the future? Before answer-

ing the question, it may help to premise a few points about primitive dialects, languages, and stocks.

As among civilized peoples, so among the uncivilized, we commonly find languages divided into closely related dialects, and related languages in turn grouped together in larger units called linguistic families or, less ambiguously, linguistic stocks. By a stock we understand a language or group of related languages that totally differ from any other language or group of related languages. Thus, the Indo-European stock with its component languages is utterly unlike and utterly unrelated to the Semitic stock with its group of related languages. In like manner, for instance, the Iroquoian languages that were spoken by the American Indians of the Lake Erie and Lake Ontario district and of part of the Southern Appalachian area are as different from the languages of the Algonquian-speaking peoples who surrounded the Iroquoian-speaking peoples on nearly all sides, as English is from Chinese. Moreover, each of these two linguistic stocks, the Iroquoian and the Algonquian, is divided into a number of languages and dialects differing from one another in many details but showing, by their clear resemblances both in words and in grammatical construction, genetic relationship. The Algonquian stock, for instance, is divided into a dozen or more languages differing from one another as much as French, English, and Greek differ from one another. The Cree, one of these Algonquian languages, is, in turn, divided into a dozen or more dialects differing from one another as much as do the Piedmontese, Venetian and Neapolitan dialects of Italian.

We are not sure of the exact number of linguistic stocks in the whole world, as there are a number of areas for which we have not sufficient linguistic evidence. On the Eurasian continent there are about twenty-five fully independent linguistic stocks. In North and South America there are about one hundred and fifty stocks, about fifty of them being represented by the Indians living within the borders of the United States.

The technical process of determining relationship or lack of it is sometimes very difficult, while at other times it is very simple. Occasional superficial similarities in words are no criterion of kinship. Thus, in Tête de Boule, the word for *egg*, *wao*, plural *wawa*, looks very much like the Latin for eggs, *ova*; the Tête de Boule particle *wi*, meaning *desire*, is not unlike our English word *wish*; the Tête de Boule adverb *put*, meaning *perhaps*, rather suggests the French *peut-être*. Such occasional resemblances in words are to be expected even between languages that have no genetic relationship whatsoever. On such insufficient evidence many a theory of relationship has been built up. It is on just such slender evidence that many a theorist has identified the Lost Tribes of Israel in this or that quarter of the globe! Such resemblances, of course, mean nothing. They are about what we would expect from the working of the law of probability in the case.

Where, however, these resemblances are extremely numerous and where grammatical processes show like resemblances we are justified in concluding genetic relationship. Thus, the Navajo living in the far Southwest of the United States are known to speak a tongue closely related to the very distant natives of the Mackenzie River watershed in Northern Canada. The great Malayo-Polynesian stock reaches from Easter Island and the Hawaiian Islands through the East Indies to Madagascar, a distance of about 15,000 miles. Many other examples could be given of the manner in which dialects and languages, either continuously or discontinuously distributed, have, in the course of time, been shown to be descended from a common source and to be really related.

On the other hand, in a great many cases, in spite of rather interesting studies, it is not possible as yet to draw confident conclusions. The Malayo-Polynesian tongues are held by some linguists to be related to a number of scattered languages on the Asiatic continent. The Hamitic languages of Northern Africa are believed by some linguists to be related to the Semitic. These conclusions are not, however, based on evidence as clear as we should like to have. Still more uncertain are the recent attempts to prove relationship between the Tchon stock of Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego and the languages of the aboriginal Australians, and the relationship between the Hokan group of languages of the California area and the Melanesian languages.

To sum up: While the process of unification has been proceeding at a fairly rapid rate, particularly within the last century, we are far, indeed, from being able to trace all the existing languages and stocks of the world to a common source. In view, moreover, of the enormous chasms that separate stock from stock, it seems highly doubtful, and in fact, highly improbable, that we shall ever be able to prove such relationship, much less to arrive at a reconstruction of the original language of our first ancestors.

## 2. Are primitive languages logically and systematically constructed?

The answer is very simple. They are. They are just about as logically and systematically constructed as are the languages of civilized peoples. Naturally, they differ as regards grammar in details and differ often in important respects from the languages of civilized peoples, but we find in them grammatical processes worked out just as regularly and just as logically as we find in any civilized tongue. In many or most respects such grammatical processes are apt to resemble in greater or lesser measure our own English or Latin. Frequently, however, we find differences. The following are a few examples, drawn chiefly from the *Tête de Boule*, of differences.

In *Tête de Boule* *ni wabamao* means *I see him*. To express past or future the particles *ki* and *ka* are interpolated. Thus, *ni ki wabamao* means *I saw him*; *ni ka wabamao* means *I shall see him*. The law is very simple; it runs

through all numbers and persons in the verb. The Tête de Boule verb has about the modes of our own, an indicative or independent, three modes corresponding more or less to our subjunctive, an imperative, etc. As to the persons, they are like our own with the exception that the Têtes de Boule have but one term to denote *he*, *she*, and *it*, and have two "we's", an inclusive and an exclusive "we". If two of us are speaking to a third party, but excluding him, as in the sentence "we see you", the "we" is exclusive. On the other hand, if two of us are speaking to a third person but including him, as in the case "we shall all die some day", the "we" is inclusive. Exclusive "we" is *ninan*; inclusive "we" is *kiranu*, and in the verbal forms the first person plural inclusive and exclusive are carefully differentiated. In the sentence "we see", with the "we" exclusive, the Tête de Boule say *ni wapinan*, whereas "we see", with the "we" inclusive, would be *ki wapinanu*.

Prefixes, suffixes, and infixes are common in primitive languages. Thus, for instance, in Tête de Boule *he sleeps*, is *nipao*; by adding the suffix *-kaso*, to form *nipakaso*, we get the meaning, *he pretends to sleep*; by adding the suffix *-ciu* to form *nipaciu* we get the meaning, *he sleeps a little*. Again, in Tête de Boule, we get diminutive and deprecative suffixes, such as are found, for instance, in Italian. Thus, *tciman* means *canoe*; *tcimanic* means *small canoe*; and *tcimanickic* means *canoe that is no good*. Again, the suffix *-skao* is used to denote abundance. Thus, *sagineo* means *mosquito*, while *sagimeskao* means *lots of mosquitoes*. The suffix *-ban* or *-oban*, if added to the name of a person, denotes that the person is dead; if to the name of a thing, that the thing is lost or is gone for good. Thus *notawi* means *my father*; *notawiban* means *my late father*; *askiuk* means *pail*, while *askiukoban* means *a pail lost or gone for good* (e. g., by being dropped overboard in the middle of the lake.) The foregoing are just a few examples of the many ways in which very regular and very systematic suffixes are utilized to express thought.

One other characteristic of Tête de Boule that may seem a little strange to us is the division of nouns, not into masculine, feminine and neuter, a division quite foreign to the language, but into animate and inanimate. The word for *child*, an animate, is *awacic*, and the plural is *awacicek*. The word for *knife*, an inanimate, is *mokuman*, the plural being formed by adding, not *-k*, but *-a*, making *mokumana*.

A device, strange to us, that crops up here and there over the globe is the use of trial and quatral numbers in personal pronouns, nouns, or verbs. We are familiar with the singular and plural from English, and with the dual from Greek, but in a few languages, particularly in parts of Oceania, we meet, in addition to the singular, dual and plural, a trial, a quatral, or both.

There are, of course, many other differences in structure between primitive and civilized languages, as there are between civilized languages and

stocks, but the few points touched upon will serve as illustrations. It should be emphasized, however, that the resemblances of primitive languages to our own in grammatical processes probably outweigh, all things considered, the differences, and that primitive languages are ordinarily quite as logical and orderly in their morphology as are our own.

3. Are primitive languages harsh and cacaphonic or soft and euphonic? No general answer can be given. Some are harsh and cacaphonic, or at least sound so to our ears. Some—for example, Bushman, with its odd clicks—appear very strange to us. But this, too, is largely a matter of what we are accustomed to. Strange consonantic clusters and combinations are sometimes met with in our own English—for instance, six-sixths, eschew, bathes. Other primitive languages are as soft and euphonic as Spanish or Italian. The great Bantu stock of Africa is notably so. The Algonquian languages are very euphonic and, as a rule, carefully avoid harsh combinations of vowels or consonants. In *Tête de Boule*, for example, *nitakwosin* means *I am sick*; *ni* is the personal element for *I*, *akwos-* is the stem for sick, while the *t* is put in purely for euphony, to avoid the concurrence of the two vowels *i* and *a*.

4. Are some languages more primitive than others? We have no reliable criterion for judging. The criteria one sometimes meets are quite unreliable. No conclusions, for instance, can be drawn from the number of words in a language. In the English Bible there occur about 7,200 words. The average educated English-speaking person knows about 30,000 to 35,000 words. Primitive languages may easily run into such numbers in their vocabularies. Bishop Baraga has listed about 13,000 Ojibwa words in his dictionary of this Algonquian tongue. The English missionary, Thomas Bridges, left a Yahgan dictionary containing about 32,430 words—the Yahgan or Yamana being one of the three languages spoken by the Fuegians of the southern tip of South America.

Such large vocabularies used sometimes to be cited as evidence that these peoples had formerly a much higher civilization and had lost it. In reality, they prove nothing at all, and are no key either to primitivity or to past or present higher cultural attainments. They witness chiefly to the actual culture of the people, and to the diligence and linguistic knowledge of the investigator who gathered together the vocabulary. It must be recalled, too, that primitive people are apt to use many concrete terms where we, with our lesser knowledge of things well known to the native, would use only one. The writer has spent many summers in the northern woods and has had pointed out to him often the three kinds of spruce—white, red, and black—that are common there. He is still unable to distinguish them confidently and so uses the one name “spruce” for them. The *Têtes de Boule* have no one name for spruce, but have and currently use distinct names for the three species, and never confuse them. Thus in this particular, as in so many

others, their native words are three times my English one. But, as is clear, this is due to their training and environment, not to greater or lesser primitivity in their language.

Nor can the relative frequency of abstract terms serve as an index of primitivity or advance. The languages of primitive peoples are sometimes said to lack abstract terms. This is very far from being the case, for example, in native American languages. It is more a matter of custom, and of manner of expression. The Têtes de Boule will often use adjectival verbs like *makadewao*, *it is black*, or *ka makadewak*, *that which is black*. I have never heard them use any noun corresponding to our noun 'blackness'. They will often say, *nipo*, *he is dead*, but do not commonly use the word for 'death', although they have one for it, *nipowin*. This is because they do not often discuss in their daily talk abstract subjects, but speak instead about concrete persons and things and events. If they really want to use the abstract term they can do so. They may add the suffix *-win*, where we would use the suffix *-ness* or *-th*. Thus *nipowin*, as above, means *death*.

Again, simplicity or complexity in grammatical processes is no reliable key to primitivity. English may be said to be grammatically simpler than Latin, but in what sense can it be called more or less "primitive" than Latin? One of the most complex languages we know is that of the Andaman Islanders, who, however, are at a very low level of culture, with no indication whatsoever that they ever had a higher one and with some indication that they are somewhat higher now than they used to be.

A short time before his death last year, Father Cataldo, the venerable old pioneer missionary of the American Northwest, wrote me the following regarding the language of the Nez Percé, of Idaho, a language of the Sahaptin stock: "The Nez Percé active verb has more than 200,000 inflections; that is, out of one verb, such as, e. g., *etéuisa*, *I love*, if you know the language well, you can make 200,000 words. The Nez Percé active verb has a great number of verbal nouns, and every noun has fourteen inflections or cases in the singular and in the plural. The verb itself has nearly fifty tenses and every tense has fourteen inflections in the singular and fourteen in the plural, except the imperative mode. Moreover, the most common active verbs have a great power of formation either by combining two words into one or by prefixing or suffixing a small particle which modifies the action of the verb a little." And the same Nez Percé are or were a people without agriculture, living under skin tents or tipis, and roaming continually in little bands of a few individuals each.

Primitive peoples know how to build up their language when faced by new cultural products. My Tête de Boule friends within a few days after my first sojourn with them had dubbed my dynamometer, out of which they got a lot of fun, *magwonigan*. *Magwon-* is the stem for *squeeze*. The affix

*-gan* or *-kan* (they do not distinguish clearly between *g* and *k*, but pronounce the consonant in between the two sounds) is used for 'instrument', thing with which or through which you perform an action. Hence their new word, *magwonigan*, means 'thing which you use for squeezing'. The onion they have, not without some humor, named *cigakomin*, from *cigak*, skunk, and *-min*, berry or round fruit. For engine of a train, they use *iskutewitaban*, that is, *iskute*, fire, and *utaban*, cart, the *u-* of *utaban* being changed into *-wi-* for euphony.

Nor can any argument for primitivity of language as such be adduced from the fact that in some primitive languages there are no words for numbers over five, or even over three and two. In some types of simple culture there is no urgent need for counting. With trading peoples, especially where some kind of currency is in use, counting becomes important. But with the few very primitive peoples who count only up to two or three or five, numbers are no more essential to their life than a knowledge of the technical terms of medicine or of scholastic philosophy is to the average American citizen.

Finally, there is no basis whatever for the view sometimes expressed that primitive languages are simple in the sense of being "monosyllabic". Chinese used to be given as an example of primitivity. We have long known, however, that formerly the Chinese was not "monosyllabic" or isolating; it became so only through later development. On the last day of my last visit to the Têtes de Boule, I heard a small boy of about four or five years of age use the following: *ki ka madjehununu*, we (inclusive) shall go away in canoe. He pronounced it as clearly and as accurately as if he were uttering a monosyllable. Sesquipedalian words are common among many primitive languages. Here is another example from the Tête de Boule: *sagiakwatak-wuska*, lots of bad windfalls, all built up and pronounced as one word, and one I have to think twice and three times about before venturing. But the natives say it as simply as we say scat.

Size of vocabulary, use of abstract terms, complexity of grammar and orderliness therein, development of numerals and similar linguistic characters are in but small if any measure indications of actual culture advance and in no appreciable measure indications of assumed former cultural levels. They are merely indications that the uncivilized peoples whom we call savages and barbarians are possessed of the same kind, and not improbably of the same degree, of rational intelligence that civilized peoples possess. Having something to say, they say it. Being human beings with reason, they say it in language built up by orderly and logical processes.

J. M. C.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON PRIMITIVE LANGUAGES

ONE of the best introductions to the languages of primitive peoples is the chapter on Language, pp. 87-136, in A. L. Kroeber's *Anthropology* (Harcourt, Brace), New York, 1923. For introduction to American Indian languages, see *Handbook of American Indian languages*, by Franz Boas, part i, Bulletin 40, Bureau of American ethnology, Washington, 1911, Introduction, pp. 1-83.

For longer introductions to the study of languages, see the following: E. Sapir, *Language* (Harcourt, Brace), New York, 1921, pp. 258; O. Jespersen, *Language: Its nature, development and origin* (Holt), New York, 1923, pp. 448.

Two recent important reviews of the languages of the world are: W. Schmidt, *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde* (Carl Winter), Heidelberg, 1926, pp. 596, with separate Atlas; A. Meillet and M. Cohen, ed., *Les langues du monde* (Champion), Paris, 1924, pp. 811, with 18 maps.

For systems of transcribing native languages, consult for details: Phonetic transcription of Indian languages: Report of committee of American anthropological association, *Smithsonian miscellaneous collections*, v. 66, no. 6, Washington, 1916, pp. 15; W. Schmidt, *Les sons du language*, tr., from *Anthropos*, v. ii, fasc. 2-6, pp. 126.

A valuable little field guide for those who may have opportunity to get original linguistic material but who have not technical training nor the chance to stay long with a given tribe is the recent *Instructions d'enquête linguistique* and *Questionnaire linguistique*, I and II, published by the Institut d'ethnologie, 191 Rue Saint-Jacques, Paris, 1928.

## FIELD METHODS

THE following paragraphs are quoted from Father Morice Vanoverbergh's "Negritos of Northern Luzon" (*Anthropos*, XX, 435-36), not for their content, but as an example of good methods in gathering and presenting ethnological information.

"When I asked Masigun what happened to a man after death, he answered me that he was buried; when I insisted and described a very bad man, who had lived a life of all possible crimes, he said he was buried too; and when a third time I asked him the same question with reference to a very good man, who had edified everybody by his exemplary life, he still answered that he also was buried like the rest. If I had lived a much longer time with them and known their peculiar Ibanag dialect much better, it would perhaps have been possible to find out exactly and definitely about their

belief or unbelief in the soul of man and its survival after death; but, as both conditions were not realized, I had to leave the problem unsolved, to my deep regret. It would have been easy for me to get a simple answer either in the affirmative or in the negative according to the way I framed my question; but I wanted to get at it indirectly, without influencing the Negrito in one way or another, and did not succeed. If I had asked him: 'You believe in the immortality of the soul, don't you?' he would have answered 'Yes'. If I had turned the question the other way 'You don't believe in the immortality of the soul, do you?' he would have said 'No'. But the result would have been scientifically the same: nothing.

"When I asked **Masigun** about the first man, our common ancestor, he said he did not know who he was. When I asked him who had made man, and from whence his origin, he gave me the same answer. But on this question I was much more fortunate on another occasion, and his belief in one God, Creator of the universe, was so clearly expressed that it really struck me with wonder. The result was especially important on account of the indirect way by which it was obtained, as everything happened without any direct query on the subject.

"Here is the conversation we had, translated as literally as possible:

"I: 'When, during a hunting expedition, you have been fortunate enough to shoot down a wild boar, what do you do then?'

"Masigun: 'We divide him then and there among ourselves and take home our share of the animal.'

"I: 'Is absolutely everything taken home?'

"Masigun: 'Yes—well, yes, but not absolutely all, we cut off a very small piece.'

"I: 'What is the use of that?'

"Masigun: 'We stick it on a sharpened piece of bamboo or rattan or something, roast it a while over the fire, and then stick the bamboo with the meat into a tree. But it is only a very, very small bit of meat.'

"I: 'You stick it in the tree and leave it there, and that is all?'

"Masigun: 'Well, no; we recite a little something.'

"I: 'What is that?'

"Masigun: 'We recite it in Ibanag' (We were talking Ilokano at the time).

"I: 'Even so, tell me what you say.'

"Masigun: '*Iwátmí nikáw, apó, te arákkami karulatán ñga itdán ta lamán.*' (This prayer is in Negrito-Ibanag, not in Ilokano, the language in which our conversation had been carried on up to this point. In correct Ibanag: *Yáwtmí nikáw, apó, ta ariákkami, karulatán ñga itdán ta lamán;*

which translated literally means: we-offer [this] to-thee, lord, so-that you-not-with-us be-disgusted to give wild-boars. This prayer was repeated to me on another occasion by the same Masigun, and still later by Firmina; the wording was a little altered, but no substantial changes were made. In the foregoing inquiry, I confined my question to wild boars to make it as concrete as possible; later I asked Masigun what they said when they had killed a deer, and he repeated the same prayer all over, changing *lamán* into *uttá, deer*. Remember that *nikáw* is the singular; the corresponding plural in Ibanag is *nikamú*.)

"I (stating my question in Ilokano): 'You say: lord; who is this fellow?' (I used purposely the term: 'daydiay', which is rather disparaging or even slightly contemptuous.)

"Masigun (answering in Ilokano): 'Who is he?' (and here the expression on his face indicated intense astonishment at my ignorance); 'well, the one who placed the earth, of course' (and at this juncture he made a wide gesture, stretching out his whole arm and moving it from left to right).

"He did not say *namarsuá*, the word which the Christian Ilokano invariably and as a matter of every-day usage employ for the Christian concept of creation, but *nañgikábil*, placed or put down, a term which the Ilokano (they have been Christian for many decades) never use and never would use to indicate creation. The Ilokano term for 'make' is *nañgarámid*, a term derived from the stem *arámid*, entirely unrelated to *kábil* or *ressuá*, the stems for *nañgikábil* and *namarsuá*, respectively. The pagan Kankanay would say *nanápo*, made, never *nañgiguá*, placed. The Christian Kankanay have taken over the Ilokano term: *namarsuá* to denote the Christian idea of creation. Masigun talks Ilokano very well and must certainly have heard the term *namarsuá*. Nevertheless, he used *nañgikábil*.

"*Namarsuá* is a derivative from the stem *ressuá*, to happen without obvious cause. *Namarsuá* is used only in the technical sense of creator or creation, never in reference to human activities, and means literally: to cause to happen.

"It may merely be added that some days before when I questioned Masigun directly if he knew who made his first ancestors, he answered that he did not know."

The foregoing quotation brings home, more vividly than would a theoretic discussion, the importance of a number of points of method, both in gathering and in presenting facts from the field.

First, Father Vanoverbergh uses the indirect question throughout in gathering information from Masigun, his chief informant on these little known Negritos of the Northern Philippines. Had he used the direct

question method, he would, in all probability, have gotten a great deal of misinformation and a great many "facts that aren't so."

Secondly, the excerpt illustrates the value of checking up information gotten from an informant, however reliable the informant may be. Father Vanoverbergh checks up a good deal of the information, not only by the use of other informants, but also by kindred questions put to the same informant under slightly altered circumstances. Even the best informant may, wittingly or unwittingly, deceive.

Thirdly, in any important point, particularly a point referring to problems such as beliefs, on which native ideas themselves may be vague, or about which there may be much difference of view among the natives themselves or else much secretiveness, it is of first importance to get, where possible, the exact words used by the informant and to give them in his native language. We are coming to attach more and more importance to such native accounts in the native tongue of aboriginal customs and beliefs. Moreover, detailed linguistic comments, such as those given by Father Vanoverbergh in the above excerpt, go very far towards making clear the exact meaning of the native's statement.

Fourthly, in important matters it is always of great value to state very clearly and in detail the exact circumstances under which a given piece of information reported was originally gathered. Our scientific ethnological sources teem with statements, often on important and crucial matters, the reliability of which statements is much open to question, owing to the fact that we are not told how, or under what circumstances, the investigation has been carried on or how the investigator gathered the material which he gives us. He may have been most scrupulous and careful or he may not have been. He may have gathered the information under circumstances that would throw a good deal of doubt upon the statement or he may have gathered it under circumstances that make his statement unexceptionable.

Fifthly, the foregoing excerpt is particularly valuable for its reserve and objectivity. Many otherwise splendid and valuable contributions to ethnology by missionary explorers, technical investigators and others have been considerably marred by loose and free interpretation of field material that makes the reader very chary of accepting even the simple objective facts recorded. In the foregoing extract Father Vanoverbergh could easily have added a page or two of surmise as to whether the beliefs he narrates have been gotten from the neighboring Ilokano or Isnag. He might have added a discussion of whether or not such a belief as he found constitutes theism or monotheism. He might have described—had he been writing fifty years ago—the possibility of the relation of the belief he found with the ancient Jewish belief. In nearly all such cases of theoretical discussion by investigators whose work has been confined to a single field, there is great danger of errors that

hurt appreciably the factual information gotten direct from the field. These theoretical interpretations are in a high percentage of cases either of no scientific value, because based on surmise, or else are positively misleading.

There are two broad fields in anthropology—the one the gathering and presenting of facts, the other the interpretation thereof. Ordinarily the field investigator, unless he has had a good deal of training in general anthropology, is very much handicapped in his interpretation of the facts he observes and records. On the other hand, a field investigator who is a resident missionary has an enormous advantage over the studio ethnologist because he has immediate personal experience of the facts which he records. A good deal of our best missionary material of an ethnological kind has often suffered appreciably because it has been interspersed with theoretic interpretations that may seem plausible enough on the surface, but are in reality untenable, or at least highly questionable.

## ABOUT THE CONFERENCE

THE present number of *PRIMITIVE MAN* is a double number, including both the July and the October issues, in sixteen pages instead of eight. With the January, 1929, issue, the eight-page plan will be resumed, and, it is hoped, now that the work of the Conference is well started, that delays of this kind will not occur in the future.

It may be emphasized again that *PRIMITIVE MAN* is intended, not as the chief publication of the Conference, but rather as a contact bulletin for the members of the Conference and as a medium for introducing the non-technical reader to the general field of anthropology. The technical publications of the Conference are the series of "Publications of the Catholic Anthropological Conference", which will be issued in separate monographs and brochures in annual series. These monographs and brochures will, for the present, total from three to four or five hundred pages per year, and will consist of original contributions to anthropological science. From time to time will be published also key papers summing up the present state of our knowledge in selected phases of anthropology.

We have on hand now about six hundred pages of manuscript material. Putting this material in shape for publication and arranging the details of publication itself have consumed a great deal of time and have necessitated considerable delay. These preliminaries have now, however, been arranged and the issuance of the first of the Publications will take place early in 1929.

The first of the Publications will be a monograph by Father Joseph Meier, M. S. C., on "Adoption among the Gunantuna", a tribe of the Bismarck Archipelago. It will total about a hundred pages. The manuscript has been given to the printer, the first batch of page proofs is now on

the secretary's desk, and the completed monograph will be ready to send out to the members of the Conference about the end of January.

The second publication will be a summary of the present state of our knowledge on the Age of the Human Race, by the Reverend Doctor Stephen Richarz, S. V. D. It will total about thirty pages, with illustrations. The manuscript will go to the printer the last week of December or the first week of January.

After this, the manuscript material on hand will be sent on for printing without further delays, as the routine arrangements will by that time be working smoothly, and no further serious practical problems will have to be met.

All numbers of *PRIMITIVE MAN* and copies of all Publications are sent gratis to each member of the Conference. The Publications will be for sale by volume or singly to non-members, that is, to libraries, institutions, and individuals, who wish to purchase them.

The Conference has not made very strenuous efforts so far to build up its membership list. It has been thought best not to do so until concrete evidence of its purpose has been forthcoming in the shape of publications. We have, however, to date three life members, nine contributing members, and sixty active members.

Inasmuch as the series of Publications proper, as distinct from *PRIMITIVE MAN*, will not actually begin until the early part of 1929, membership dues paid during the course of 1928 will be considered as covering dues until the end of the year 1929.

## CHILD-TRAINING: BIBLIOGRAPHY

UNFORTUNATELY, we possess no entirely satisfactory authoritative and thorough study of the subject. Two of the best short introductions to the whole field are: A. J. Todd, *The Primitive Family as an Educational Agency* (Putnam), New York and London, 1913, ch. vi-vii, pp. 141-225, and Hutton Webster, art. "Primitive Peoples, Education Among", in *Monroe's Cyclopedic of Education* (Macmillan), New York, 1913, v; both are well done and both give selected bibliographies. Either could be recommended as a good starting point for anyone desirous of obtaining a bird's-eye view of the subject. Two additional worthwhile studies are: Elsie C. Parsons, *The Family* (Putnam), New York and London, 1906, lecture V, 90-111, and A. F. Chamberlain, *The Child and Childhood in Folk-Thought* (Macmillan), New York and London, 1896. Some important aspects of the subject are treated in the excerpts in W. I. Thomas' *Source Book for Social Origins* (University of Chicago Press), Chicago, 1909, part ii, 141-331, with extensive bibliography. A classic work dealing in extenso with nearly all

phases of child life is: Ploss-Renz, *Das Kind*, 3d ed., 2 vols. (Grieben), Leipzig, 1911-12.

An excellent review of adolescent rites is given in: Hutton Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies* (Macmillan), New York, 1908.

Some valuable educational data are contained in such works as: Dudley Kidd, *Savage Childhood, A Study of Kafir Children*, London, 1906; Frank Spencer, *The Education of the Pueblo Child* (Macmillan), New York, 1899; Charles Eastman, *Indian Boyhood* (McClure, Phillips), New York, 1915, an autobiography; Truman Michelson, *Autobiography of a Fox Indian Woman*, Rpt. 40, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D. C., 1925. On education among the American Indians, in addition to particular studies, such as the three foregoing, see: Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*, Bull. 30, Bureau of American Ethnology, *ibid.*, 1907-10, articles, "Education" by O. T. Mason, "Child Life" by James Mooney, "Ethics" by M. C. Stevenson and W. Matthews, and "Puberty Customs" by J. R. Swanton. Cf., also the valuable summary by A. F. Chamberlain, "Education (American)," in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. For systems of education practiced by the chief peoples of archaic, classic, and Oriental culture, see *ibid.*, Hastings' E. R. E., under "Education" and "Children."

Two works that are not infrequently referred to as sources may be omitted as of less or little importance: G. H. Payne, *The Child in Human Progress*, New York and London, 1916, and Oscar Chrisman, *The Historical Child*, Boston, 1920. The most recent work in English, W. D. Hambly, *Origins of Education among Primitive Peoples* (Macmillan), London, 1926, contains much good scattered material, but is very sketchy and leaves much to be desired both as to accuracy and as to thoroughness and balance.

The foregoing bibliography had, for lack of space, to be omitted from the April number of *PRIMITIVE MAN*.

## CATHOLIC ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONFERENCE

### AIMS:

The advancement of anthropological and missionary science through the promotion of:

- Anthropological research and publication by Catholic missionaries and other specialists, and of
- Ethnological training among candidates for mission work.

### MEMBERSHIP:

Open to all, clergy and laity, Catholic and non-Catholic, interested in the aims of the Conference.

Dues: Active members.....	\$ 5.00 a year
Contributing members.....	10.00 a year
Sustaining members.....	25.00 a year
Life members.....	100.00

### PUBLICATIONS:

All classes of members receive:

1. PUBLICATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONFERENCE—the annual series of brochures and monographs;
2. PRIMITIVE MAN—published quarterly.

Please address all applications for membership and other communications to the Secretary-Treasurer,

**REV. JOHN M. COOPER  
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D. C., U. S. A.**



